



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,755	06/15/2001	Olivier Marce	Q64933	5934

23373 7590 10/18/2007
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

FOX, BRYAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/880,755	Applicant(s) MARCE ET AL.	
	Examiner Bryan J. Fox	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12 and 15-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant in view of Garceran et al (US006522888B1).

Regarding claim 4, Gallant discloses a system and method for consistently translating a Special Dialing String (SDS) or a Mobile Feature Code (MFC) in a wireless telecommunications system based on mobile subscriber and/or geographic information (see column 3, lines 12-22), which reads on the claimed, "method of accessing from a mobile telephone one of a set of services stored in a telecommunication network associated with said mobile telephone," and, "determining said service by the

geographical location of said mobile telephone and a service request including a short-code number supplied by a user to said mobile telephone, wherein the short-code number identifies a single service in a given geographical area.” The system includes multiple MSCs (see figure 1), which reads on the claimed, “said telecommunication network including a plurality of control stations wherein the mobile telephone connects to only a single one of the control stations at any time.” Gallant fails to disclose each of said control stations stores a set of services in a respective local database not local to other control stations of said telecommunication network.

In a similar field of endeavor, Garceran et al disclose a system where a database may be local to the MSC (see column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 30).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gallant with Garceran et al to include the above database local to the MSC in order to reduce the storage needed in a centralized database.

Regarding claim 10, Galant discloses a system and method for consistently translating a Special Dialing String (SDS) or a Mobile Feature Code (MFC) in a wireless telecommunications system based on mobile subscriber and/or geographic information (see column 3, lines 12-22), which reads on the claimed, “control station in a telecommunication network including means for communicating with a set of mobile telephones further including means for implementing a method of accessing from a mobile telephone one of a set of services,” and, “in which method said service is determined by the geographical location of said mobile telephone and a service request including a short-code number supplied by a user to said mobile telephone, and the

short-code number identifies a single service in a given geographical area.” The system includes multiple MSCs (see figure 1). Gallant fails to disclose each of said control stations stores a set of services in a respective local database not local to other control stations of said telecommunication network.

In a similar field of endeavor, Garceran et al disclose a system where a database may be local to the MSC (see column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 30).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gallant with Garceran et al to include the above database local to the MSC in order to reduce the storage needed in a centralized database.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12 and 15-17 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The remarks in the Appeal Conference filed May 3, 2007 were persuasive with respect to claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12 and 15-17.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J. Fox whose telephone number is (571) 272-7908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles N. Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bryan Fox
October 15, 2007


CHARLES N. APPIAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER